

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for his courtesy in conducting a telephonic interview with Applicants' representative, Van C. Ernest, on April 12, 2004. An agreement was reached that claim 1 would be amended to recite (as originally drafted) that a provisioning server receives a DSL service order, and that claim 31 would be amended to clarify that a provisioning server executes the computer program. It was further agreed that DAVIS (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,525) does not teach an interface as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 18, 24, 31 and 38. The Examiner indicated that he would perform an additional search in response to the April 12th interview and the amended claims.

Upon entry of the present amendment, paragraphs [0046] and [0070] of the specification will have been amended to correct minor typographical errors. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments to the specification.

Further, upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1 and 31 will have been amended in accordance with the interview with the Examiner, discussed above. In particular, claim 1 will have been amended to add receiving a service order ---at a provisioning server---, which was originally recited in claim 1 and removed pursuant to Applicants' Reply under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, filed May 27, 2003. The preamble of claim 31 will have been amended to clarify that the claimed computer program is ---executed by a provisioning server---. Claims 18 and 24 will have been amended to clarify that the interfaces enable communications with the corresponding facilities. Also, claims 16, 32-37 will have been amended to correct minor informalities in claim language. Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

P20422.A06

In the above-referenced Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 18-19, 22-23 and 31-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by SUNDARESAN et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,079) in view of DAVIS (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,525). The Examiner rejected claims 8-17, 20-21, 24-30 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over SUNDARESAN et al. in view of DAVIS in further view of BYERS (U.S. Patent No. 5,926,472). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, at least for the reasons stated below.

The Examiner relied on DAVIS, in combination with SUNDARESAN et al., to teach determining an interface corresponding to each facility used for provisioning a DSL service. As addressed during the interview mentioned above, DAVIS discloses interfacing between a subscriber line and a network. It does not teach or suggest determining interfaces corresponding to multiple assigned facilities, where the interfaces convert DSL provisioning data into protocols associated with the corresponding facilities, or otherwise enable communication with the corresponding facilities. Accordingly, with respect to independent claims 1, 18 and 31, withdrawal of the rejections based on any combination including the DAVIS reference is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claims 8, 24 and 38, the Examiner additionally relied on BYERS, in combination with SUNDARESAN et al. and DAVIS. BYERS was cited for configuring of an optical concentrator device. Therefore, even assuming proper motivation for combining these references, BYERS does not overcome the deficiencies of SUNDARESAN et al. and DAVIS, discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections based on the combination of these references is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 2-7, 9-17, 19-23, 25-30 and 32-37, Applicants assert that they are


P20422.A06

allowable at least because they depend from independent claims 1, 8, 18, 24 and 31, respectively, which the Applicants submit have been shown to be allowable.

In view of the herein contained amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all previously asserted rejections set forth in the Official Action of February 4, 2004, together with an indication of the allowability of all pending claims, in due course. Such action is respectfully requested and is believed to be appropriate and proper.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this Reply or the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Timothy Russell KLOS et al.


Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

April 27, 2004
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191